

REMARKS

Status of the Claims

Claims 3-5, 7, 11-20, 26-28, 31, and 35-36 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Claims 1, 2, 6, 8-10, 21-23, 25, 29-30, 32, and 34 have been amended. New claims 37-43 have been added. No new matter has been added. Claims 1, 2, 6, 8-10, 21-25, 29-30, 32-34, and 37-43 are pending.

Claims 1-4 and 6-9 are Allowable

The Office has rejected claims 1-4, 6-9, and 36, at paragraphs 1-1.9 of the Office Action, under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,341,160 (“Tverskoy”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,853,714 (“Liljestrand”), and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,826,026 (“Friedman”). Claim 36 has been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Applicants respectfully traverse the remaining rejections.

The cited portions of the above-cited references fail to disclose or suggest the specific combination of claim 1. For example, the cited portions of Tverskoy fail to disclose or suggest identifying an email address associated with a calling party by comparing caller identification (ID) information received to a contact list, where the caller ID information is received with a call, as in claim 1. Instead, Tverskoy discloses that a control system 26 generates an e-mail message for each voice message stored in memory 22, and that each e-mail message has a header conveying information about the voice message such as time of the call and caller identification information, if any was received with the call. *See* Tverskoy, col. 4, lines 64-col. 5, line 2. The cited portions of Tverskoy fail to disclose or suggest identifying an email address associated with a calling party by comparing caller identification (ID) information received to a contact list, where the caller ID information is received with a call, as in claim 1.

Further, the cited portions of Liljestrand do not disclose or suggest this element of claim 1. Instead, Liljestrand discloses that a caller’s email address can be stored in a contact list in a subscriber profile. *See* Liljestrand, col. 17, lines 55-57. The cited portions of Liljestrand do not disclose or suggest comparing caller ID information received with a call to a contact list. The cited portions of Liljestrand do not disclose or suggest identifying an email address associated

with a calling party by comparing caller identification (ID) information received to a contact list, where the caller ID information is received with a call, as in claim 1.

Further, the cited portions of Friedman do not disclose or suggest this element of claim 1. Instead, Friedman discloses a communication line interface unit 216 providing logical and physical interface to an external communication line, and includes a modulator to modulate signals transmitted along the communication line and a demodulator for demodulating signals received along the communication line. *See* Friedman, col. 7, lines 58-64. The cited portions of Friedman do not disclose or suggest identifying an email address associated with a calling party by comparing caller identification (ID) information received to a contact list, where the caller ID information is received with a call, as in claim 1.

Therefore, the cited portions of Tverskoy, Liljestrand, and Friedman, separately or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest each and every element of claim 1. Hence, claim 1 is allowable. Claims 2-4 and 6-9 depend from claim 1, and are therefore allowable, at least by virtue of their dependence from allowable claim 1.

Claim 10 is Allowable

The Office has rejected claim 10, at paragraph 2 of the Office Action, under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), as being unpatentable over Tverskoy in view of Liljestrand, further in view of Friedman, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,304,636 (“Goldberg”). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

As explained above, the cited portions of Tverskoy, Liljestrand, and Friedman, separately or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest each and every element of claim 1, from which claim 10 depends. The cited portions of Goldberg do not disclose the elements of claim 1 that are not disclosed or suggested by the cited portions of Tverskoy, Liljestrand and Friedman. For example, the cited portions of Goldberg do not disclose or suggest identifying an email address associated with a calling party by comparing caller identification (ID) information received to a contact list, where the caller ID information is received with a call, as in claim 1. Instead, Goldberg discloses a network node 12 that stores a list of all called parties that are subscribed to a voice message system and a corresponding e-mail address for each called party. *See* Goldberg, col. 2, lines 14-17. (Emphasis added). Therefore, the cited portions of Tverskoy, Liljestrand,

Friedman, and Goldberg, separately or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest each and every element of claim 1, or of claim 10, which depends from claim 1. Hence, claim 10 is allowable.

Claims 21-25 are Allowable

The Office has rejected claims 21-27, at paragraphs 3-3.7 of the Office Action, under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), as being unpatentable over Tverskoy in view of Liljestrand. Applicants have canceled claims 26 and 27 without prejudice or disclaimer. Applicants respectfully traverse the remaining rejections.

The cited portions of Tverskoy and Liljestrand do not disclose or suggest the specific combination of claim 21. For example, the cited portions of Tverskoy do not disclose or suggest employing a messaging device to compare caller identification (ID) information received with an incoming telephone call to a contact list to identify an email address associated with a calling party, as in claim 21. Instead, Tverskoy discloses that a control system 26 generates an e-mail message for each voice message stored in memory 22, and that each e-mail message has a header conveying information about the voice message such as time of the call, and caller identification information, if any was received with the call. *See* Tverskoy, col. 4, lines 64-col. 5, line 2. The cited portions of Tverskoy do not disclose or suggest employing a messaging device to compare caller identification (ID) information received with an incoming telephone call to a contact list to identify an email address associated with the calling party, as in claim 21.

The cited portions of Liljestrand do not disclose or suggest this element of claim 21. In contrast to claim 21, Liljestrand discloses that a caller's email address can be stored in a contact list in a subscriber profile. *See* Liljestrand, col. 17, lines 55-57. The cited portions of Liljestrand do not disclose or suggest employing a messaging device to compare caller identification (ID) information received with an incoming telephone call to a contact list to identify an email address associated with the calling party, as in claim 21.

Therefore, the cited portions of Tverskoy and Liljestrand do not disclose or suggest each and every element of claim 21. Hence, claim 21 is allowable. Claims 22-25 depend from claim 21, and are therefore allowable, at least by virtue of their dependence from allowable claim 21.

Claims 29-30 are Allowable

The Office has rejected claims 29 and 30, at paragraphs 4-4.2 of the Office Action, under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,483,899 (“Agraharam”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,621,800 (“Klein”). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections.

The cited portions of Agraharam and Klein fail to disclose or suggest the specific combination of claim 29. For example, the cited portions of the Agraharam fail to disclose or suggest a computer-readable medium storing computer-readable instructions that when executed by a processor, cause the processor to obtain an email address associated with a calling party by comparing caller identification (ID) information to a contact list, where the caller ID information is received with an incoming telephone call, as in claim 29. Instead, Agraharam discloses a calling party can input an email address of an intended recipient via speech recognition software or by utilizing a telephone keypad. See Agraharam, col. 3, lines 20-24. (Emphasis added).

Further, the cited portions of Klein fail to disclose or suggest a computer-readable medium storing computer-readable instructions that when executed by a processor, cause the processor to obtain an email address associated with a calling party by comparing caller identification (ID) information to a contact list, where the caller ID information is received with an incoming telephone call, as in claim 29. Instead, Klein discloses a voice messaging system allowing monitoring of telephone calls. See Klein, Abstract. The cited portions of Klein do not disclose or suggest obtaining an email address of a calling party.

Therefore, the cited portions of Agraharam and Klein, separately or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest each and every element of claim 29. Hence, claim 29 is allowable. Claim 30 depends from claim 29. Therefore, claim 30 is allowable, at least by virtue of its dependence from claim 29.

Claims 32-34 are Allowable

The Office has rejected claims 32-35, at paragraphs 5-5.4 of the Office Action, under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), as being unpatentable over Agraharam in view of Klein, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,026,152 (“Cannon”). Claim 35 has been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Applicants respectfully traverse the remaining rejections.

The cited portions of Agraharam, Klein, and Cannon, separately or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest the specific combination of claim 32. For example, the cited portions of Agraharam do not disclose or suggest a messaging engine to obtain an email address associated with a calling party by comparing caller identification (ID) information to a contact list, where the caller ID information is received with a call, as in claim 32. Instead, Agraharam discloses that a calling party can input an email address of an intended recipient via speech recognition software or by utilizing a telephone keypad. *See* Agraharam, col. 3, lines 20-24. The cited portions of Agraharam do not disclose or suggest a messaging engine to obtain an email address associated with a calling party by comparing caller identification (ID) information to a contact list, where the caller ID information is received with a call, as in claim 32.

Further, the cited portions of Klein fail to disclose or suggest a messaging engine to obtain an email address associated with a calling party by comparing caller identification (ID) information to a contact list, where the caller ID information is received with a call, as in claim 32. Instead, Klein discloses a voice messaging system allowing monitoring of telephone calls. *See* Klein, Abstract.

Further, the cited portions of Cannon do not disclose or suggest a messaging engine to obtain an email address associated with a calling party by comparing caller identification (ID) information to a contact list, where the caller ID information is received with a call, as in claim 32. Instead, Cannon discloses an outgoing pre-recorded announcing message. *See* Cannon, col. 3, lines 64-65. Cannon further discloses a variable ring count device to determine a ring count for an incoming call. *See* Cannon, Abstract. The cited portions of Cannon do not disclose or suggest a messaging engine to obtain an email address associated with a calling party by comparing caller identification (ID) information to a contact list, where the caller ID information is received with a call, as in claim 32.

Therefore, the cited portions of Agraharam, Klein, and Cannon, separately or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest each and every element of claim 32. Hence, claim 32 is allowable. Claims 33-34 depend from claim 32. Therefore, claims 33-34 are allowable, at least by virtue of their dependence from allowable claim 32.

Claims 37-43 are Allowable

New claims 37-43 have been added. No new matter has been added. Support for claims 37- 39 and 41-43 can be found at least at paragraph [0040] of the Specification. Support for claim 40 can be found at least at paragraph [0033] of the Specification.

Claims 37-40 depend from claim 1, which Applicants have shown to be allowable. Therefore, claims 37-40 are allowable, at least by virtue of their dependence from claim 1.

Further, the cited portions of Tverskoy, Liljestrand, and Friedman, separately or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest preparing a reply email message, where an outgoing address line of the reply email message is automatically populated with an email address associated with a calling party, as in claim 37. For this additional reason, claim 37 is allowable.

Claim 41 depends from claim 21, which Applicants have shown to be allowable. Therefore, claim 41 is allowable, at least by virtue of its dependence from claim 21.

Further, the cited portions of Tverskoy and Liljestrand, separately or in combination, do not disclose or suggest preparing a reply email message, where an outgoing address line of a reply email message is automatically populated with an email address associated with a calling party, as in claim 41. For this additional reason, claim 41 is allowable.

Claim 42 depends from claim 29, which Applicants have shown to be allowable. Therefore, claim 42 is allowable, at least by virtue of its dependence from claim 29.

Further, the cited portions of Agraharam and Klein, separately or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest a computer-readable medium of storing instructions that, when executed by the processor, cause the processor to prepare a reply email message, where an outgoing address line of the reply email message is automatically populated with an email address associated with a calling party, as in claim 42. For this additional reason, claim 42 is allowable.

Claim 43 depends from claim 32, which Applicants have shown to be allowable. Therefore, claim 43 is allowable, at least by virtue of its dependence from claim 32.

Further, the cited portions of Agraharam, Klein, and Cannon, separately or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest an email reply engine to prepare a reply email message, where an outgoing address line of the reply email message is automatically populated with an email address associated with a calling party, as in claim 43. For this additional reason, claim 43 is allowable.

CONCLUSION

Applicants have pointed out specific features of the claims not disclosed, suggested, or rendered obvious by the cited portions of the references as applied in the Office Action. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of each of the objections and rejections, as well as an indication of the allowability of each of the pending claims.


Any changes to the claims in this amendment, which have not been specifically noted to overcome a rejection based upon the cited art, should be considered to have been made for a purpose unrelated to patentability, and no estoppel should be deemed to attach thereto.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below if such a call would in any way facilitate allowance of this application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees, which may be required, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account Number 50-2469.

Respectfully submitted,

3-30-2009
Date



Jeffrey G. Toler, Reg. No. 38,342
Attorney for Applicants
Toler Law Group, Intellectual Properties
8500 Bluffstone Cove, Suite A201
Austin, Texas 78759
(512) 327-5515 (phone)
(512) 327-5575 (fax)